

REMARKS

Claims 1-8 are pending. Claims 1 and 7 are independent.

The specification and claims 1 & 5 have been objected to for informalities. In response, the specification and claims 1 & 5 have been amended as indicated by the Examiner. Accordingly, applicant respectfully requests removal of this rejection.

The Office rejected claims 1-8 under 35 U.S.C 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite. In particular, that

It is indefinite as to how, or if, the one or more pipeline registers that are arranged in "said control connections" are the same as the one or more pipeline registers that are arranged in a dedicated direct signal data signal connection between any two of said clusters. In the instant disclosure (particularly page 4, lines 18-29 which have been cited by applicant), the pipeline register that is arranged in the control connection paths, in order to pipeline the control signals, is not described as being between any two of the clusters. (Office Action, both at paragraph 6 and paragraph 7)

In response, independent claims 1 and 5 have been amended to recite the limitations of: "...each control connection having a pipeline register," and

"one or more additional pipeline registers arranged in said control connections to a remote cluster of said plurality of clusters, depending on the distance between said instruction unit and said plurality of clusters, so as to pipeline said control connections to said remote cluster."

Thus from amended claim 1 and 5, it is shown that whether additional pipeline registers are arranged in the control connections, and whether one or more additional pipeline registers are arranged in each of the control connections, or one or more

additional pipeline registers are arranged with respect to all the control connections depend on the distance between the instruction unit (IFD) and the clusters (A-D) at the ends of the respective connection, i.e., it is not necessary to arrange additional pipeline register(P) if the distance is short, and one or more additional pipeline registers(P) can be arranged if the distance is long.

These amendments in claims 1 & 5 are supported by the description (see page 6, lines 25-30 and figure 3): *“Accordingly, the number of pipeline registers P between clusters can be proportional to or dependent on the distance between the respective clusters. Moreover, one or more pipeline register P are arranged in the control path CC and CD. Alternatively one or more pipeline registers P are arranged in each of the control paths CC and CD, in order to pipeline the control signals to remote clusters C, D.”*

Further, according to the description (e.g., page 6, second paragraph and page 5, lines 2-4 and figure 1), claim 1 is further defined with the added functional feature as noted below, in order to make the technical feature of arranging pipeline register(P) depending on the distance in claim 1 easy to understand: *“Wherein one or more additional pipeline register is arranged in said control connections depending on the distance between said instruction unit (IFD) and said clusters, so as to pipeline said control connections to remote cluster among said clusters.”*

Accordingly, one skilled in the art can determine, based on the distance, whether there is a need of arranging one or more additional pipeline registers in a plurality of control connections to pipeline the control connections to the remote clusters.

For at least the reasons set forth in above, Applicant respectfully submits that the claims are well within the requirements of 35 U.S.C. § 112, ¶ 2. Therefore, Applicant respectfully submits the rejection can no longer be sustained.

Claims 1-3 and 5-7 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Batten et al. (Batten) (US 6269437) in view of Nickolls et al. (Nickolls) (US5598408). Claims 4 and 8 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Batten and Nickolls as applied to claims 3 and 7 above, and further in view of Pechanek et al. (Pechanek) (US 5659785).

As noted above independent claims 1 and 5 have been amended to recite the limitations of: "...each control connection having a pipeline register," and

"one or more additional pipeline registers arranged in said control connections to a remote cluster of said plurality of clusters, depending on the distance between said instruction unit and said plurality of clusters, so as to pipeline said control connections to said remote cluster." Applicant can find nothing in Batten or Nickolls, alone or in combination, that teaches the above limitations.

Since Batten or Nickolls, alone or in combination, does not teach all of the limitations of independent claims 1 and 5, as amended, it cannot render the present invention obvious. For at least the above cited reasons, Applicant submits that Claims 1 and 5 are patentable over Batten and Nickolls.

With regard to claims 2-4 and 6-8 each of these claims depends from one of the independent claims discussed above, which have been shown to be allowable in view of the cited references. Accordingly, each of claims 2-4 and 6-8 are also allowable by virtue of its dependence from an allowable base claim.

Applicant denies any statement, position or averment stated in the Office Action that is not specifically addressed by the foregoing. Any rejection and/or points of argument not addressed are moot in view of the presented arguments and no arguments

are waived and none of the statements and/or assertions made in the Office Action is conceded.

For all the foregoing reasons, it is respectfully submitted that all the present claims are patentable in view of the cited references. A Notice of Allowance is respectfully requested.

Respectfully submitted,

Dan Piotrowski
Registration No. 42,079

Date: January 11, 2011

/Thomas J. Onka/
By: Thomas J. Onka
Attorney for Applicant
Registration No. 42,053

Mail all correspondence to:
Dan Piotrowski, Registration No. 42,079
US PHILIPS CORPORATION
P.O. Box 3001
Briarcliff Manor, NY 10510-8001
Phone: (914) 333-9624
Fax: (914) 332-0615